

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 remain in this application.

In response to Applicant's amendment and remarks dated June 11, 2004, the Examiner asserts that Wagner's use of a weak signal driver and delay elements to drive data through a scan chain necessitates the conclusion that:

. . . there is no difference between the applicant's minimizing a sudden current rise or surge (which the goal is to minimize a current error) and the minimization of scan shift race conditions in the prior art since the both the applicant's invention and Wagner's system minimizes current errors (current rises or races).

12/21/2004 Final Office Action, p. 2.

Applicant believes the Examiner is inappropriately equating the concepts of "race" and "surge". According to one source, a current "surge" is a sudden and possibly damaging increase in current; and a "race" is a condition in which data propagates rapidly through a logic circuit, far ahead of the clock signal intended to control its passage. A current surge does not necessarily lead to a "race" or "error". On the other hand, a race does not necessarily lead to a "current surge".

As applicant previously argued, Wagner's disclosure is void of any discussion of current surges (or the mitigation thereof).

If the Examiner persists in his equating of the concepts of "race" and "surge", applicant requests that the Examiner please review this position with his supervisor.

2. Timeliness of Response

The two-month deadline for filing this Response fell on President's Day, February 21, 2005. As a result, this Response is believed to be timely filed on February 22, 2005, the next business day.

Appl. No. 09/908,948
Response dated Feb. 22, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of Dec. 21, 2004

3. Conclusion

In light of the above remarks/arguments, applicant respectfully requests the timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
DAHL & OSTERLOTH, L.L.P.

By:



Gregory W. Osterlof
Reg. No. 36,232
Tel: (303) 291-3200